



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,038	04/14/2000	Susumu Okada	32584	9156

116 7590 04/07/2004

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

JERABEK, KELLY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,038

Applicant(s)

OKADA ET AL.

Examiner

Kelly L. Jerabek

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/23/2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9, 11, 13 and 15-21 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 10, 12 and 22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments, see page 15 filed 1/23/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 13, 15, 16, and 19-20 under U.S.C. 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Morgan US 4,992,866.

The indicated allowability of claims 2, 12, and 22 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference to Morgan US 4,992,866 as submitted in the applicants' information disclosure statement. The claims that have been amended to include the subject matter that was previously indicated to be allowable are rejected based on the newly discovered reference. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,3-4,10,12, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan US 4,992,866.

Re claim 1, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus, the camera is panned.

Re claim 3, the map display (fig. 2: 50) stores information about the positions of obstructions existing in the line of sight of the cameras (fig. 2: 74; col. 5, lines 49-56). Cameras undesirable for shooting the location are eliminated from candidates considered by the camera selection algorithm (col. 6, lines 39-46).

Re claim 4, the wall (fig. 2: 74) is an obstruction in the view of the cameras (col. 5, lines 49-56). The only camera that is capable of viewing the safe (fig. 2: 70) is camera (72) because the wall (74) obstructs the view of the other cameras (fig. 2: 3, 24). Therefore, the wall (74) is displayed by cameras (3, 24) when the area around the safe (70) is selected by the user.

Re claim 10, images captured by the camera selected by the determination section are displayed greater than images captured by other cameras. The images are displayed according to a priority scheme. When all monitors are active, the monitor with the lowest priority camera image will be replaced with the new higher priority image provided by the determination section (col. 6, lines 53-63).

Re claim 12, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which

Art Unit: 2612

the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). Also, the zoom scale is determined for each of the cameras examined as being optimal for shooting the designated location (col. 6, lines 39-52).

Re claim 22, Morgan discloses in figure 2 a user interface for a camera selection and positioning system. Images are taken by remote cameras (fig. 1: 34,36) and displayed on video monitors (fig. 1: 22,24,26,28) (col. 3, lines 20-33). A camera control area display section (fig. 2: 30) displays camera symbols (fig. 2: 24,3,32) representing the locations of the cameras and wedges (fig. 2: 64,68) indicating the directions in which the cameras are oriented (col. 5, lines 11-20). The map (fig. 2: 50) has a coordinate pattern that corresponds to areas of the touch screen (30). When the user touches an area on the screen a camera is selected for optimal shooting of the designated location (col. 5, lines 16-21). When the selected camera is not in not already pointed at the designated location it will rotate towards the location (col. 5, lines 18-21). Thus, the camera is panned. When the cameras optimal for shooting the designated location are selected, images are displayed according to a priority scheme, thus displaying the images at respective scales (col. 6, lines 53-63).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-9, 11, 13, 15-21 allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art fails to show an angular-shift-time calculation section for calculating the time required for the camera to pan toward the designated location and a focus-shift-time calculation or a zoom-shift-time calculation for calculating the time required for the camera to attain a focus or to zoom on the designated location as stated in independent claims 5, 9, 17, and 21. Claim 6 depends on claim 5 and claim 18 depends on claim 17, thus they are also allowable.

Prior art fails to show that the camera-to-be-operated determination section determines a camera to be operated based on the angle between the current shooting direction of the camera and the direction of an imaginary line connecting the designated location with the center of the camera symbol as stated in independent claims 7 and 13. Claim 8 depends on claim 7 and claims 11, 15, 16, 19, and 20 depend on claim 13, thus they are also allowable.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Kelly Jerabek whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2612

(703) 305-8659. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached at (703)-305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

The fax number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306.

The fax number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the Examiner at (703) 746-3059.

KLJ


VU LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER